

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant has carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-27 in the application. The Applicant presently amends Claim 11. Accordingly, Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the application.

I. Formal Matters and Objections

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as being informal. The Applicant requests that the Examiner hold the objection in abeyance until such time as the Examiner indicates allowable subject matter.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 11 as requiring correction. While the Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner, Claim 11 has been amended in an effort to expedite prosecution.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 6,029,164 to Birrell, *et al.* ("Birrell"). However, Birrell fails to disclose, among other elements, a message parser that locates hypertext references in e-mail messages, as recited in Claims 1, 10 and 19 of the present application. In contrast, Birrell merely discloses parsing words in e-mail messages, wherein each specific word is arbitrarily assigned a sequential location number. (Column 7, lines 17-34). Thus, Birrell merely discloses determining the location of every unique e-mail

message word and assigning a location number thereto, rather than determining the location of hypertext references in e-mail messages, as recited in Claims 1, 10 and 19 of the present application.

Birrell also fails to disclose, among other elements, a message organizer that allows e-mail messages to be displayed in an order that is based on the hypertext references, as recited in Claims 1, 10 and 19 of the present application. In contrast, Birrell merely discloses first indexing email messages based on the above-described word parsing and subsequently labeling the messages as “inbox,” “unread” or “delete.” (Column 9, lines 4-26). Birrell then retrieves the indexed and labeled messages by issuing full-text queries of the parsed e-mail message words and displays the retrieved messages in the temporal order of when the messages were received. (Column 9, lines 28-52, and column 11, lines 4-8). Further, Birrell specifies that there is no need for allowing sort orders for display other than the temporal order of when the messages were received. (Column 11, lines 9-11).

Therefore, Birrell is not an anticipating reference for Claims 1, 10 and 19 of the present application. Because Claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27 are dependent upon Claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively, Birrell also cannot be an anticipating reference for Claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to Claims 1-27.

III. Additional References Made of Record

The Applicant believes that the additional references made of record and not relied upon by the Examiner are not particularly pertinent to the claimed invention, but the Applicant retains the right to address these references in detail, if necessary, in the future.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-27.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made." The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES & BOISBRUN, P.C.



Mark E. Kelley
Registration No. 45,857

Dated: 7/1/01

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please rewrite Claim 11 as follows:

11. (Amended) The method as recited in Claim 10 further comprising [further] causing said e-mail program to display a message field containing said hypertext references.